

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments made above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are pending in the Application. Claim 11 is added by this amendment. By means of the present amendment, claims 1-10 are amended including for better conformance to U.S. practice, such as deleting reference numerals typically used in European practice that are known to not limit the scope of the claims. Further amendments include correcting typographical errors, amending dependent claims to begin with "The". By these amendments, claims 1-10 are not amended to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve the right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or continuing applications.

Applicant(s) thank(s) the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s).

In the Office Action, the drawings are objected to because of lack of the label "Prior Art" in FIG 1. In response, "Prior Art" has been added to FIG 1. A replacement sheet including FIG. 1 is enclosed. It is respectfully submitted that the drawings are now in proper form and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are objected to for informalities. It is respectfully submitted that the amendment of claims 1-10 to be in better form renders these rejections moot. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to claims 1-10 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,809,006 to Davis ("Davis"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-10 are allowable over Davis for at least the following reasons.

Davis is a typical configuration for an optical disk device wherein an EFM decoder 1210 produces both of binary data and a input clock channel (see, FIG. 12). This is similar to the configuration shown in the present patent application FIG. 1. As stated in the present patent application, (emphasis added)"[i]n the state of the art, the encoder provides the clock signal and the data signal at two separate output terminals, and these two signals

are transferred to the optical pickup unit over two physically separate transfer paths, i.e. separate lines. Since the encoder is located at a relatively large distance from the optical pickup unit, these two physically separate transfer paths inevitably have an effect on the phase difference between the clock signal and the data signal. This effect is hardly predictable or controllable, and may vary with time and temperature; the effect may be such that timing margins are reduced or even eliminated." (See, present application, page 2, line 24.)

These two signal paths are shown in Davis, FIGs. 2-4 depiction of a recording device, including signal line 212, wobble signal generator 247 and optical deflector 242 and the accompanying description contained in Col. 6, line 56 through Col. 7, line 10. As such, Davis suffers the same clock and synchronization problems that the present application are directed at solving.

It is respectfully submitted that the laser driver circuit of claim 11 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Davis. For example, Davis does not disclose or suggest, an laser driver circuit that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis added) "a signal input configured to receive a single encoded signal from an eight-to-fourteen encoder device

which contains data information and clock information, ... a signal generator comprising an input coupled to the signal input of the laser driver circuit, a data output coupled to the data input of the flipflop, and a clock output coupled to the clock input of the flipflop, wherein the signal generator is configured to generate at its data and clock outputs a digital data signal and a digital clock signal, respectively, from the data information and clock information received at its signal input" as recited in claim 11, and as similarly recited in each of claims 1 and 8. Davis in fact shows a laser driver circuit that receives a separate data and clock signal from the eight-to-fourteen encoder device.

Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 11 are patentable over Davis and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 2-7 and 9-10 respectively depend from one of claims 1 and 8 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the

foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By Gregory L. Thorne

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
July 7, 2008

Enclosure: Replacement drawing sheet (1 sheet including FIG. 1)

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101